

Novice

Parli

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	SumPrep IG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Liam Isaacs	N/A	N/A
	Nathaniel Griffin	N/A	NA

NEGATIVE

POS	BisOD CM	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Shawn Cunningham	30	1
	Hailey McKenna	30	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from BisOD CM
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: George Swaha, Leland

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

20-30
 7 min 1A
 7 min 1N
 7 min 2A
 7 min 2N
 5 IN
 5 1A

As per the note (attached) from Sum Prep IG, the team was not shown up due to ~~the~~ an illness and BisOD wins by default.

George Swaha

11/18/12

Dear Judge,
I am the
coach from Summit
Prep. One team
member is ill so
the win for Rb
goes to
Bishop O'Dowd.
Thanks Michelle

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisO'D PD	POINTS /Max = 30	RANKS
	Kendall Post	29	1
	Bryce Dewitt	27.4	3

NEGATIVE

POS	DiaVal JY	POINTS /Max = 30	RANKS
	Paul Jeon	28	2
	Brandon Ye	27	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from BisO'D PD
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: George Sunala, Leland

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

"The USFG should allow the military sequester to occur."

A very good debate with both teams having strong arguments, articulating points well and providing supporting facts. All debaters could improve by speaking slower, with more punctuation. Paul had the best delivery (including body language), but Kendall was most convincing.

The win goes to Affirmative (BisO'D PD) team for being more convincing by focusing on 2 points:

1. the cut is not that big for military (still the largest by far military force in the world, ^{only} going back to 2007 budget)
2. Applying money to economy will prevent fiscal diff, strengthen the economy & ultimately the country/military.

NEG team had many more arguments but it resulted in less focus and some of the arguments (support for democracy around →

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi WH	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Andre Wang	26.5	2
2	Eric Han	26.8	4

NEGATIVE

POS	SumPrep DG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Sean Decker	26.8	3
2	Elsa Gernand	27.5	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from SumPrep DG
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

2N - very earnest and believable. quiet passion - moving, strong, humane.
 1N - Voice and style and responses to questions make me believe that he is interested in the truth winning. He may wish to be careful about conceding too much.
 1A - I like strong clear questions
 2A - good voice, sincere. Work on more eye contact; it will show more conviction.
 2N - effective discussion on ineffectiveness of \$\$ due to inflation - calm & reasoned.
 1 vote for the negative based on the neg's argument that the increase of \$ has 1. marginal value (offset value) 2. may be devastating (hyper-inflation) and severely impacts a key constituency (senior retirees)
 Elsa was devastating in her warm but deadly attack on the Aff's abandonment of senior citizens.
 Initially I was swayed by the Aff's focus on improving the economy. This was an excellent tactic. However, ~~included~~ they did not include senior citizens in the coming wave of prosperity that the better \$ economy would bring. This was fatal. Too cold blooded. I would have liked to have heard ~~me~~ argument more forcefully.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi LW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	② Richard Liu	25	4
	① Brendan Wu	26	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Prospect SS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	① Smith, Austin	26	2
	② Smith, Akshay	25	3

The better debating was done by the Negative from Prospect
AFF / NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: [Signature]

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams had excellent speakers.
The affirmative team ran into problems with a fundamental misunderstanding of what a corporate tax rate is, what the fiscal cliff represents, and what the benefits of outsourcing are.
The opposition team pointed out the flaws in the affirmative's arguments.
Affirmative needs to be careful not to bring up new arguments in their last speech. The fiscal cliff being caused by the 35% tax rate was a new argument and there was no evidence to support it.
All four debaters argued effectively - the affirmative just had ~~fundamental~~ fundamental errors that the negative pointed out.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland WP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	David Webb	26	1
	① Grace Phan	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog KC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	① Hamza Khawaja	25	3
	Sahil Chawla	25	4

The better debating was done by the Affirmative from Leland
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Both teams argued well, but they often did not effectively debate each other's points, rather they just reiterated the same points, but without adding any information that strengthens their arguments. Some information was inaccurate, but that was not given much weight unless the ~~opponent~~ ^{opponent} cancelled it out. Opposition was correct that banks fail and affirmative agreed to it. Opposition hung most of its case on their contention that the Federal Reserve's actions will have no impact on the economy or on citizens. Affirmative cited negative impacts of low interest rates for citizens. Affirmative explained why the Federal Reserve changes the interest rates and why it should raise ~~the~~ it.

The affirmative won the very close debate. I would encourage the teams to define all important terms early in the debate - definition of terms was very muddled and at times made it difficult to understand how the understood the Federal Reserve (what type of bank it is).

The four debaters all spoke very well.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE


POS	NotDam LW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Caroline Liongasari	24	3
1	Elizabeth Wu	25	1

NEGATIVE

POS	Wash SV	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Rahual Sheth	22	4
4	Anirudh Veeraragavan	24	2

The better debating was done by the AFF from Caroline Elizabeth
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

Caroline started ~~off~~ with a well organized position with four strong supporting statement. She connected this with the underlying value. Elizabeth defended the points well and was able to refute some of the opponents challenges. She was clear & logical in her arguments. Both were very composed & poised.

Rahual & Anirudh were more energetic, however some of their challenges were not logical (ex: EKS = enforcer). They did have some good supporting points, ~~however some of their challenges were not logical~~ and some fair attacks on the affirmative position. Overall, a great debate. Both teams did well.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga KS	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
3	Kunal Kanekar	24	1
4	Mihir Samdarshi	23	2

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi AB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Vikshar Athreya	20 20	4 4
1	Prachit Bhike	21 21	3 3

The better debating was done by the AFF from Saratoga
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: 

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

note
 Utilitarian
 Kunal - #1 Maximize tax 34-35 - good
 #2 Reduced economic growth top 4
 #3 tax on gold etc #5 Skill
 - WP
 #4 and higher tax etc.

Mihir - Good down to earth examples
 - Washington post
 - Apple
 - GM/chrysler - A little bit of
 surplus - 10 min
 - GDP.

note Prachit
 #1 Raise tax some good
 counter argument - some
 #2 economy is a bus. repetition
 - security + job capital gain
 1 need it for econ
 2 extended tax cut will hurt the econ -10-20 yr.
 - negative result

Vikshar
 - Good voice in debate
 - NO counter-conv.
 - SA
 - ~~SA~~

Kunal did a very good job of setting the arguments / key points and linking to the value of Utilitarian. Mihir did a good job of debating & attaching ~~the~~ the other sides points. Both members had a little difficulty with the topic. They also repeated themselves a few times. Overall the affirmative had a stronger debate. Prachit started off well in the first session, however only had two supporting points. His presentation poise and confidence was decent. Vikshar had some fairly good organization, however did not support or refute the opponents points well. This team did not link to a value.

A

5

~~Deadwiler, Brand~~

Delinda Dane

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	BisOD SJ	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
1	Ryan Seideman	24	3
3	Anna Johnson	26	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg AG	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
4	Basil Abushama	26	1
2	Nihal Gowda	23	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from Bis OD SJ
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Delinda Dane

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

USFG should extend all the Bush tax cuts.

AFF = define - extend continue using child tax credit, tax rate
 plan - extend 6 mo
 ACTOR USFG = net benefit to citizens

1) Economy getting better - 15-7 3990 increase
 more money going into economy
 unemployment 11.5% = 7.8% is down
 private sector 4.5 mil jobs created last year - more jobs = more tax money + money in economy

1995 - no budget = economic slow down
 2) Fiscal Cliff = recession = less jobs = death = no college = bad future
 600 Bil in spending cuts / economic growth slow down

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Car/Mont

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam AC	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Kimia Ashktorab	3	21.4
	Melissa Cuevas	2	21.8

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg DB	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Anh Diep	28.2	1
	Priya Bhattacharjee	21.0	4

The better debating was done by the Neg from Everg DB
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kenneth Hip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

~~Anh has~~ Everyone have good energy, confidence, and thought. Anh has good body movement and language. Melissa has ease of confidence and speaks a good pace. Everyone was understandable, spoke their point well. Definitely one of the better debates I witness

Decision was for Negative priming because of their point were slightly better. Their counter of Inflation being too high and barrel of money to buy bread was very vivid. Aff should have counter that this is a control Inflation and it should not occurred. That was the small point that tip the scale for neg. almost all other points were spoken and counter well include: possibility of occurrence, definition of common good, faster recovery, Image of China out the hole.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

Carlmont

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	OliChi CD	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Ishika Chawla	26	2
	Neha Dubey	28	1

NEGATIVE

POS	JamLog CW	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Zachary Chee	23.5	4
	Brian Wang	24	3

The better debating was done by the AFF ^{KW} ~~JamLog~~ from OliChi CD ^{KW} ~~JamLog~~
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTINGENT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Kenneth Hip

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

- Neha spoke with conviction, energy and passion. Good Posture.
- Ishika spoke with quiet confidence
- Brian needs to stand up straight, act confident even though you are sick, there is no need act sick
- Zach ~~has~~ has confidence in posture and easiness but when speaking was not smooth and or continuation of thought speech seemed to jump around

AFF won because of organize of argument and ^{neg} ~~aff~~'s counter of Bank and later small Bank ~~did~~ do not have money did not counter all points of neg money to pay back rang ^{adding} ~~the~~ ^{Aff} people did not have false. ~~They~~ also counter better. ^{Neg} ~~Aff~~ should pay a bit more attention to other teams speeches it seems ~~Brian and Zach~~ ^{Aff} were not paying a lot of attention.

~~Please make initialy I had Aff and Neg mixed up~~

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Leland KK	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sohil Kshirsagar	26.1	4
1	Matthew Kang	26.7	2

NEGATIVE

POS	Saratoga CP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
2	Sabrina Chen	26.8	1
1	Sonal Pai	26.1	3

The better debating was done by the NEG from Saratoga CP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: _____

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION: USFG should significantly raise the capital gains tax.

2N - example given for income tax vs capital gains on middle class/entrepreneurs was devastating to the affirmative. The clarity of this example devastated the
1A - good clear voice strong. I like voice. murkiness of the affirmative's "cap gains based on income" model

I voted for the NEG because they clearly stated the damage that could be done to the middle class by using example (good job Sabrina). Also Neg was able to place doubt as to how increase would be paid.

Again, to reiterate the above, the NEG's concrete example using the impact to an entrepreneur of income tax vs capital gains was devastating in its clarity.

Affirmative's key strategy of income-based capital gains rates was not clear. It was not clear to me how it would be implemented.

Affirmative did not make clear how "circulating" the economy or "fluctuating" the economy would in fact "boost" the economy. Words not explained.

Neg created doubt in Aff's "morally correct" argument.

(over)

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	Saratoga AX	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	David Akeley	27	2
	Kelly Xiao	26	3

NEGATIVE

POS	OliChi DP	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Julia Park	25	4
	Gaurisha Dewan	27	1

The better debating was done by the NEG from OliChi DP
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended:

Signed: Joseph Nguyen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: solid contentions but lack of depth and not well developed. good in rebuttals with strong, clear-cut points. However, overall presentation is a bit weaker than the NEG.

NEG: well presented arguments with good supporting info, stats. Some contentions are not strong but articulated well/or just better than ^{the} AFF.

Both teams need to work on presentation skills/delivery. In this round, the NEG has a little bit edge over the AFF.

SCU DEMPSEY-CRONIN INVITATIONAL

11/16/2012 through 11/19/2012

The round should begin 20 minutes after you give teams the topic

AFFIRMATIVE

POS	NotDam YN	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Czarina Yip	27½	2
	Divya Nikkanti	27	3

NEGATIVE

POS	Everg LL	POINTS Max = 30	RANKS
	Minh Le	27½	1
	Nieman Liu	26	4

The better debating was done by the AFF from NotDam YN
AFF or NEG TEAM OR CONTESTANT NAME

Please check on this line if a low-point win was intended: _____

Signed: Joseph Nguyen

COMMENTS & REASON FOR DECISION:

AFF: The arguments are well developed, clear delivered with solid theoretical ground ("capitalistic approach," market econ. ...) However, the national debt is not fully dealt with even though with "sufficient" counter balance for this tax cut by capital gain increase. Need more support in stats/authorities/evidence.

NEG: The arguments are centered upon the ^{national} debt and the wealthy having too much of a break. Good stats & info to support ~~the~~ the contention. However, the presentation goes far off to tangential issues, such as dictatorship, ~~North Korea~~ ^{North Korea} ... not strong enough to refute the AFF's grounded arguments. So, the AFF has an edge in this debate.